

**REMARKS**

Applicants do not agree that claim 7 prior to this amendment lacked novelty with respect to Lamb. However, in the interests of advancing prosecution applicants have amended claim 7 to correspond with dependent claim 37, which was not rejected based on Lamb. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claim 7 in its prior form in future prosecutions. Claim 37 has been cancelled.

Claim 7 (and claim 37) were rejected for lacking novelty in view of Mamers and Nishibori. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Mamers and Nishibori relate to recovering cellulosic fibers from, for example, poly-coated paper used in milk cartons. Both describe procedures for separating the polymer in the poly-coated paper from the cellulosic fibers. See Mamers, col. 2, lines 32-47 and Nishibori, Fig. 1 (83a are plastic film fragments that have been separated from the cellulosic fibers (84)).

The texturized fibrous material required by claim 7 are produced from poly-coated paper. But the internal cellulosic fibers of the paper are not separated from the polymer component of the paper. Applicants believe that this was clear in claim 7 prior to the present amendment. However, claim 7 has been amended to be more explicit on this point; see, for example, Example 1 in the application for support.

Thus, claim 7 is novel in view of Mamers and Nishibori.